ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 5/31/65 | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1a. ACCESSION NUMBER: ED003247
2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).: 8071
3. IDENTIFICATION NO.: N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Brunner, Ken August and Lindquist, Clarence B.

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES X NO ☐

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Recent Faculty and Instructional Practices in Junior Colleges

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES X NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES X NO ☐

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: Junior College Journal

TYPE OF REPORT: PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☐ FINAL X FOLLOW-UP ☐

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN: ORG. AAJC; ST. 1785 Mass. Ave., NW; CITY. Wash., 6, D.C.

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: American Assn. of Junior Colleges

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
XXX	327-339	Feb. 60	13

FILE. EXT. INST/LOC CODE

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Survey

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

higher ed.	teachers	retention		
surveys	teaching methods			
junior colleges	recruitment			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Directed to the problem of securing and holding qualified faculty members, this study explores the extent to which colleges and universities follow certain specified practices in coping with this problem. Twenty-one such practices were listed in the questionnaire distributed to 1,940 institutions of higher education in the United States and outlying parts. Respondents were asked to check whether or not the practices were followed during the period July 1957 to June 1958, and if they were, whether or not they had been followed due primarily to faculty shortages, due equally to faculty shortages and other reasons, or due primarily to reasons other than faculty shortages. Analyses of responses are given separately for junior colleges and for all other colleges. The rate of response from junior colleges was 76.3 percent and 85.3 percent from all other colleges.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT: Reporter No. 6

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

R-6-9
x 23

[Reprint from JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL, February, 1960, VOL. XXX, No. 6]

8071

Recent Faculty and Instructional Practices in Junior Colleges

KEN AUGUST BRUNNER and CLARENCE B. LINDQUIST

JUNIOR COLLEGES seem to be faced with a triple dilemma. Along with other higher educational institutions they must first of all prepare to meet the onrushing tidal wave of students now in the secondary schools. A second, perhaps more frightening, look into the future reveals that many four-year colleges and universities are increasingly looking to the junior colleges to relieve them of some of the burdens of high future enrollments of freshman and sophomore students. Likely to be overlooked in the midst of this future age of students aplenty is the need to bring the collegiate level of education to a higher proportion of high school graduates than now receive it. Contingent problems are being recognized, and possible solutions are being tried out. This article deals with one of the problem areas—proper staffing.

Increasingly the literature has contained suggestions as to how to meet the need for college faculty members at a time when Ph.D.'s are just not keeping up with the demand curve. To be sure, junior colleges have never actively sought the holders of the Ph.D. degree. A few—maybe as high as 10 per cent—have seemed adequate for any junior college faculty. The junior college needs the master teacher, not the research-oriented specialist, but as the four-year colleges and universities feel the Ph.D. pinch, they will be competing more and more for holders of the M.A. degree. Thus, they will be encroaching more and more upon a staffing area in which the junior colleges have been the most active.

It is a matter of concern, then, to consider the problem of securing and holding qualified college faculty members. There are a number of institutional practices possible to enable colleges and universities to cope with these problems. In order to determine the extent to which certain specified practices are being employed, and more particularly the extent to which they are being followed because of faculty shortages, the Office of Education in May, 1958, mailed a questionnaire to the presidents of 1,940 institutions of higher education in the United States and its outlying parts. There were 1,610 responses to the questionnaire received in time to be included in the study, and 376 of this number came from the universe of 493 junior colleges. The rate of response from

KEN AUGUST BRUNNER is Specialist for Associate Degree and Related Programs, Division of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

CLARENCE B. LINDQUIST is Chief for Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Division of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

ED000247

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

the junior colleges, therefore, was 76.3 per cent. This compares with the 85.3 per cent response from all institutions except the junior colleges. The purpose of this article is to highlight the findings of the study as they relate to junior colleges, provide information that is more detailed concerning junior colleges than is given in either of two other publications,[1] and make comparisons between junior colleges and all the other colleges an duniversities.

As part of the data sought in the questionnaire, respondents were asked to check whether or not the practices listed in the instrument were followed during the period July, 1957, to June, 1958, and if they were, whether or not these practices had been followed: (1) due primarily to faculty shortages; (2) due equally to faculty shortages and other reasons; or (3) due primarily to reasons other than faculty shortages. Table 1 in this article contains the 21 practices which were listed on the instrument and gives the number and per cent of junior colleges and of institutions other than junior colleges following each practice during this period *because of any reason at all* in addition to the number and per cent of these categories of institutions following these practices *because of faculty shortages.* In this tabulation, institutions which followed practices due equally to faculty shortages and other reasons are considered to have followed this practice due to faculty shortages along with those which had done so primarily for this reason.

Although institutions followed many of the practices for reasons other than faculty shortages, it is apparent that the employment of them would in most instances reduce the total need for staff. Many of the practices which formed the basis of this study have been followed in the nature of experiments, frequently supported by educational foundations. In other instances the practices may have been followed because they were considered to be sound administrative or educational actions.

PRACTICES FOLLOWED FOR ANY REASON

A number of analyses may be made of Table 1. First, it will be noted that junior colleges follow only two practices *for any reason* more frequently than the other colleges. The difference here is not great. It is more significant that there are sharp differences between practices followed by all other colleges from those followed by junior colleges in a number of items. For example, in making a comparison on the basis of percentage of use of practice, the practice of employing new faculty members at salaries relatively higher than formery paid for corresponding ranks is followed by all other colleges 75 per cent more than it is followed by junior colleges. Similarly, only 11.1 per cent of the junior colleges report employing new faculty at relatively higher ranks than formerly given for corresponding positions, whereas other colleges and universities report 25.8 per cent. Thus, this practice is used (on a percentage basis) 132 per cent more by senior colleges than by community colleges. And in the practices of employing

[1] Dr. Lindquist's preliminary report of the findings of the study involving 1,557 institutions appeared in the November, 1958, issue of *Higher Education,* and a complete report has been published as U. S Office of Education Bulletin No. 27, 1959, titled *College and University Faculties: Recent Personnel and Instructional Practices.*

TABLE 1

Extent of Use of Specified Practices in 376 Junior Colleges Compared with 1,234 Other Kinds of Colleges in the United States During 1957–58

PRACTICE	Followed Practice For Any Reason: Junior Colleges No.	Percent[a]	All Other Colleges No.	Percent[a]	Followed Practice Due to Faculty Shortages: Junior Colleges No.	Percent[a]	All Other Colleges No.	Percent[a]
1. Employment of retired professors and other retired persons	102	29.1	518	44.6	73	20.8	383	33.0
2. Employment part-time of persons whose incomes are mainly from other occupations	197	57.6	791	68.3	100	29.2	436	37.7
3. Sharing instructors and instructional facilities with other institutions	127	38.0	414	37.0	53	15.9	192	17.1
4. Employment of new faculty less qualified than formerly for positions occupied	159	45.0	515	44.5	148	41.9	487	42.1
5. Employment of new faculty at salaries (ranks same) relatively higher than formerly	138	39.8	801	69.7	129	37.2	646	56.2
6. Employment of new faculty at ranks (salaries relatively the same) relatively higher than formerly	36	11.1	282	25.8	27	8.4	240	22.0
7. Employment of new faculty at both ranks and salaries relatively higher than formerly	46	14.6	396	36.3	33	10.5	340	31.2
8. Accelerated promotion of faculty	46	15.2	302	28.4	26	8.6	215	20.2
9. Employment of some faculty members beyond mandatory retirement age	82	24.8	450	40.1	56	16.9	298	26.6
10. Increase of the established mandatory age limit	25	7.9	99	9.2	23	7.3	67	6.3
11. New fringe benefits established or existing ones increased	150	44.8	727	65.3	68	20.3	262	23.5
12. Salary increases of at least 5 percent per annum for faculty as a whole	279	82.5	961	85.1	140	41.4	451	39.9
13. Increase in the size of lecture sessions	144	41.5	536	46.8	81	23.3	393	34.3
14. Reduction of duplicating and overlapping course offerings	124	37.9	709	64.2	54	16.5	300	27.2
15. A significantly larger responsibility placed on student for his own learning	70	21.7	449	41.1	22	6.8	177	16.2
16. Use of non-professional assistants to help relieve faculty of non-teaching duties	35	25.0	430	38.5	39	11.5	259	23.2
17. Reduction in number of smaller classes	166	50.2	626	56.0	84	25.4	368	32.9
18. Elimination, curtailment, or postponement of some programs of study	159	47.0	536	47.6	76	22.5	298	26.5
19. Reduction in the number of subcollegiate courses of instruction	46	14.3	251	24.1	22	6.8	111	10.7
20. Courses given completely or primarily by television	12	3.5	71	6.5	3	0.9	17	1.6
21. Courses given completely or primarily by films	5	1.5	33	3.0	3	0.9	9	0.8

[a] Percents in this column and other columns of this table are based upon the number of responses to each practice which varied due to the fact that some of the practices were not applicable in some situations and also some of the questionnaires were not fully completed.

new faculty members at both relatively higher salaries and ranks than formerly, the figure is 150 per cent. Of course, it is recognized that junior colleges are very much less prone to award any academic rank except "instructor."

It will be noted that some practices approach being used twice as much by the other colleges and universities as by junior colleges: accelerated promotions, more responsibility for learning, courses taught completely or primarily by TV, and courses taught completely or primarily by films.

The preceding analysis has been based upon a comparison of the percentage of use of each of the specified practices. Another approach is that of rank-order comparison in which, for junior colleges and likewise for all other colleges, the specified practices are listed in order of decreasing percentage of use of the practices. Table 2 gives this information for practices followed for any reason whatsoever and Table 3 for practices followed because of faculty shortages.

It can be observed that in only seven of the practices was there a difference in rank-order of three or more. The greatest difference was the practice of employing personnel at higher salaries. This was ranked eighth by the junior colleges as a practice followed for any reason in the past several years, whereas it was

TABLE 2

Practice Followed for Any Reason	Junior Colleges Rank Order	Other Colleges Rank Order	Diff. In Rank Order
Salary increase of at least 5 per cent	1	1	0
Employment of part-time persons	2	3	–1
Number of smaller classes reduced	3	6	–3
Programs eliminated, curtailed, postponed	4	7	–3
Employment of less qualified persons	5	10	–5
New or increased fringe benefits	6	4	2
Lecture sections enlarged	7	8	–1
Employment at higher salaries	8	2	6
Inter-institutional sharing	9	14	–5
Duplicate and overlapping courses reduced	10	5	5
Employment of retired persons	11	9	2
Non-professional assistants used	12	13	–1
Employment beyond retirement age	13	12	1
More student responsibility for learning	14	11	3
Accelerated promotions	15	16	–1
Employment at higher ranks and salaries	16	15	1
Subcollegiate courses reduced in number	17	18	–1
Employment at higher ranks	18	17	1
Retirement age raised	19	19	0
Courses completely or primarily by TV	20	20	0
Courses completely or primarily by films	21	21	0
			21–21

ranked second by other colleges and universities. Three items showed a difference in rank-order of five positions. The junior colleges report as their fifth most important practice *for any reason* the employment of less qualified personnel than those who previously held the positions, whereas the four-year colleges and universities rank this tenth. The ninth most important reason cited by junior colleges was "inter-institutional sharing" which was ranked 14th by the other colleges and universities. In the other direction, what was ranked tenth by the junior colleges, that is, "reducing duplicated and overlapping courses," was ranked as fifth most important by four-year colleges and universities.

It may be of some concern to friends of the junior college to note that the third practice followed was the "reduction of the number of smaller classes," whereas this ranks sixth with other colleges and universities, especially in view of the fact that junior colleges tend to boast that they offer more direct faculty-student contact and more smaller class situations. Along the same line, it is notable also that "programs have been eliminated, curtailed, or postponed" ranks as the fourth most important practice by junior colleges, whereas this is seventh for the other colleges and universities. Another significant difference in rank-order is found in the 14th most important practice followed by junior colleges, "giving the student more responsibility for learning." The other colleges and universities rank this as the 11th most important practice followed for any reason in the past several years. It would seem here, too, that the junior colleges might re-examine their philosophies and consider giving this a more important place in the future.

PRACTICES FOLLOWED AS A RESULT OF FACULTY SHORTAGES

Practices followed because of faculty shortages bring out even more sharp differences between the practices followed by the junior colleges as compared to those followed by the other reporting institutions. For example, reporting institutions other than junior colleges are employing the following practices more, percentage-wise, than junior colleges: employment of new faculty at both ranks and salaries relatively higher than formerly, 197 per cent more; a significantly larger responsibility placed on the student for his own learning, 138 per cent more; accelerated promotion of faculty, 135 per cent more. There are other large differences, but they will again be examined by the rank-order differences method.

It will be noted that in this case there are only four instances where the differences are three or greater. The sharpest difference is one of six ranks. In 14th position is the practice of employing personnel at higher ranks and salaries than previously, whereas the other colleges and universities have found themselves compelled to use this as the eighth most important practice because of faculty shortages. In the other three examples, the junior colleges favored a practice over the other colleges and universities. For example, "programs were eliminated, curtailed, and postponed" in junior colleges more than they were in senior colleges as compared to other practices which were followed. This practice ranks seventh with the junior colleges and universities. The "inter-institutional sharing of faculty" was ranked 12th by the junior colleges and 16th by the other colleges and universities. "New or increased fringe benefits" was ranked

TABLE 3

Practice Followed Because of Faculty Shortages	Junior Colleges Rank Order	Other Colleges Rank Order	Diff. In Rank Order
Employment of less qualified persons	1	2	–1
Salary increase of at least 5 per cent	2	3	–1
Employment at higher salaries	3	1	2
Employment of part-time persons	4	4	0
Number of smaller classes reduced	5	7	–2
Lecture sections enlarged	6	5	1
Programs eliminated, curtailed, postponed	7	11	–4
Employment of retired persons	8	6	2
New or increased benefits	9	12	–3
Employment beyond retirement age	10	10	0
Duplicate and overlapping courses reduced	11	9	2
Inter-institutional sharing	12	16	–4
Non-professional assistants used	13	13	0
Employment at higher ranks and salaries	14	8	6
Accelerated promotions	15	15	0
Employment at higher ranks	16	14	2
Retirement age raised	17	19	–2
More student responsibility for learning	18.5	17	1.5
Subcollegiate courses reduced in number	18.5	18	0.5
Courses completely or primarily by TV	20.5	18	0.5
Courses completely or primarily by films	20.5	21	–0.5
			17.5–17.5

ninth by the junior colleges and 12th by other colleges and universities. Other differences, as has been mentioned, were not as sharp.

Perhaps more important is the fact that junior colleges were not reporting that they were required to follow certain practices *due to faculty shortages* as much as senior colleges and universities. In no case did even one-half of the junior colleges report that they have had to resort to certain practices because of faculty shortages, whereas in the case of the four-year colleges and universities, 56.2 per cent have been required to employ people at relatively higher salaries than had been paid for the position in the past. Only five practices were reported by as many as 25 per cent of the junior college administrators as being required *because of the shortage of faculty.*

At the head of the list for the junior colleges the practice most commonly followed, as reported in this survey, was the employment of less qualified personnel than had previously filled the positions. Of the junior colleges, 41.9 per cent reported that they had to resort to this practice because of faculty shortage. Close on the heels of this practice was the salary increase of at least five per cent brought about because of faculty shortages. The third most commonly reported practice by junior colleges was employment at relatively higher salaries than previously had been paid for these positions. This practice

was followed by 37.2 per cent of the junior colleges. Ranked fourth by the junior colleges was the employment of part-time persons, at 29.2 per cent. And ranking fifth (this is the only other one that was reported by 25 per cent or more of the junior colleges) was that the number of smaller classes had been reduced—reported by 25.4 per cent of the junior colleges.

It is worth noting that the four-year colleges and universities reported 11 practices were followed by over 25 per cent of the institutions because of faculty shortage.

Another way of looking at this is to regard the number of practices that were followed due to faculty shortages as compared to those that were reported as being followed for any reason. In the case of the other colleges and universities, 17 practices were reported as being followed *for any reason,* not specifically because of faculty shortages, by over 25 per cent of the reporting institutions, whereas in the case of the junior colleges, 13 practices were reported as having been followed *for any reason* in the past several years. (An additional practice was reported as being followed by 24.8 per cent of the junior colleges.)

Perhaps the most obvious conclusion that can be tentatively arrived at from this recital of facts and from this analysis of the responses is that the junior colleges are less acutely aware of having followed certain of these practices because of the apparent developing shortages of teaching personnel. On the other hand, it may be the junior colleges have not yet felt the pinch of faculty shortages as much as other colleges and universities. This is borne out by an analysis of the comments that were made in the responses to the Office of Education survey.

COMMENTS BY RESPONDENTS

In the form which was submitted to the junior colleges, respondents were invited to make general comments concerning faculty staffing problems (if any) at their institutions, methods of coping with them, and the relative effectiveness of these methods. The respondents were asked to specify the time period in which the problem occurred and improvement that was made. Some of the responses which follow indicate how junior colleges have recognized and coped with these new dimensions to the problem of faculty recruitment and retention.

A midwest junior college head pointed out that although he felt the problem had not yet affected his college as much as others because of its fine reputation, a program in electronics had to be delayed for one year until he could find a qualified person at the salary paid his instructional staff. The recession and fewer government contracts at an aircraft plant put him in a position to secure instructors in electronics and in physics.

Of interest to junior college authorities in reading open-ended responses to this survey are statements that point up the impression that in general junior colleges have not yet had any problem in recruiting faculty. At least four college presidents made statements to this effect. For example, the president of a public junior college in the Rocky Mountain states reports, "To date we have not experienced any great difficulty employing well-qualified teachers. We have several applications for each vacancy."

A similar statement was made by the

president of a California public junior college, and the president of a publicly-supported junior college in the Northwest reports, "We seem to have little difficulty now, or at any time in the past." A comparable written comment was made by the dean of a publicly-supported midwestern junior college.

Five junior college heads attributed their success in obtaining faculty to their newly achieved high salary schedules or to their prevailing high salary schedules. Some typical comments were as follows.

The president of a California junior college in a relatively isolated community went into some detail about his salary schedule. He pointed out that the range was from $4,920 for a beginning teacher with a baccalaureate degree to $9,250. A beginning M.A. degree teacher, and this is required for appointment as a junior college instructor in this community, "qualifies for a salary of $5,880. Consequently, we have few staffing problems."

The dean of a publicly-supported midwestern junior college pointed out that his salaries were even better than those paid in other state institutions of higher education. Similar statements were made by the president of a publicly-supported junior college in a northwestern state and the dean of a Florida public junior college who pointed out that his salary schedule is above that of the other units of the public school systems in his area and in adjoining states. One midwestern junior college president enclosed his salary schedule as "part of the answer as to why we have no trouble getting good teachers."

Another means of attracting instructors to the junior college, also related to the salary question, is that pointed out by the assistant dean in charge of a branch of a large midwestern metropolitan junior college. He said, "Of perhaps greatest significance is the fact that new teachers may be placed in the salary schedules above the minimum, in consideration of experience." This practice of paying higher beginning salaries than the usual scale for beginning college teachers was also reported by other junior colleges. Especially was this the case in areas such as science and engineering. Some remarks were made by two-year college heads to illustrate this problem area. Typically, the president of a public community college in New York commented that because of the difficulty they have getting staff members with engineering degrees, "We have not attempted to start technical staff members at the beginning instructor level."

A comment made by the president of a junior college in an eastern state indicates that his location has been an asset:

> Because of our location we find that a great source of part-time teachers is among younger faculty and graduate students at neighboring institutions, but these arrangements, though commonly effected through officials at the neighboring institutions, are always on an individual basis and cannot be said to constitute 'Sharing facilities with other institutions.'

One of the public junior college heads even credited his active teachers' retirement plan along with the availability of social security as among the reasons he has little faculty turnover.

A number of heads of junior colleges which shared facilities with a high school, or which were a part of a large high school, reported that they had no problem at all in obtaining satisfactory, qualified instructors for the junior college. A sample

comment was made by a midwestern public junior college president: "This questionnaire does not apply to any great extent to a junior college that is part of a large high school."

The dean of a publicly-supported junior college in a Middle Atlantic state reported, "One of the ways we have met faculty needs in the junior college is by recognizing outstanding ability and superior preparation of secondary school teachers who may be interested in working with older young people." In considering the relationship between the high school and the junior college the president of a California junior college commented, "Being part of a city system in which we have several schools under the same board of education we have from time to time taken outstanding people from these faculties and brought them to the college." Still another California junior college head, who is also the superintendent of a public junior college district, reports that because of his location within 16 miles of a large state university, within 16 miles of a state college and fairly close to a prominent privately-supported university, he has no difficulty in securing a faculty.

Other reasons cited to support the ease with which faculty members were obtained for junior colleges were: pleasant teaching climate, which was reported by the dean of a publicly-supported midwestern junior college, and a stable enrollment, which came from the president of a state-supported junior college in the Southeast. "Ours is a state-supported junior college offering liberal arts primarily. Almost no changes in curriculum nor changes in teacher personnel took place during the times mentioned. We added two new instructors in 1957 but had no trouble getting them and employed them under the same policies as existed in the immediate past."

A similar statement was made by another junior college president in a southeastern state. He, too, reported a constant enrollment and stable faculty. The president went on to say, "We usually have more applications from qualified people than we can possibly use in our faculty. Insofar as we have had the need to increase our faculty, we have depended largely upon our personal acquaintance with or knowledge of qualified people."

The president of a New England technical institute reports that faculty members are permitted to do research and consulting work for the equivalent of one day a week. Apparently this is a method he has used successfully to cope with the shortage of the scientific and engineering faculty members reported by a number of junior college presidents.

At least eight junior college heads made comments about the difficulty of securing instructors in the technical areas and in the sciences. By far this item received the greatest number of comments.

Typical of the responses was one made by the dean of a public junior college in a northwestern state who said:

> The only staffing problem we have encountered has been the filling of a position on the engineering staff. Industry pays such high beginning salaries compared to teaching salaries and combining this with a policy of strict adherence to a salary schedule, we do have a difficult problem. Perhaps this may be solved by turning to the source of immigrant engineers that are migrating to this country. We are exploring this possibility now.

An eastern junior college head also reported difficulty in hiring fully-trained experienced instructors in the "physical sci-

ences, engineering, and mathematics at the salary levels which this college can afford to pay. The problem has been partially solved by the part-time employment of academically qualified instructors with no previous instructional experience."

Other shortages singled out for comments by the junior college heads were of trained librarians as well as women's physical education instructors. Again this problem was reported by heads of junior colleges in the Midwest and in California.

A California junior college director reported that he particularly had trouble finding "credentialed" persons to teach physical education. In some cases, this director said even when he could find people properly credentialed he had not found them sufficiently well-qualified to do the job he wanted done.

A plains state junior college academic dean reported a similar difficulty. Being church-related, his school depends on the membership of the supporting church body for recruiting members of its staff. They are not necessarily, therefore, from the same state in which the college is located. The dean stated, "Our principal difficulty is meeting the certification requirements established for junior colleges of the state. The certification requirements were set for secondary schools without cooperation of the junior colleges. No improvement made."

The problem of finding adequate properly certified teaching personnel was also noted by the head of a Florida junior college. According to state requirements applicants for junior college instructor certification must possess a master's degree and a minimum of 15 graduate hours in the teaching field. The dean said, "This is a requirement of our State Department of Education along with the professional courses in education. We are sometimes at a disadvantage in hiring persons with advanced degrees who do not have the professional education courses."

The same problem was commented on by the director of a California public junior college who said that some of his applicants "have several years of experience and sufficient qualifications, but do not have the work in formalized education." To solve this problem, he usually obtains provisional credentials for these people until they can complete the required work, usually in professional education courses.

The head of a large midwestern metropolitan junior college branch found that his college has been taking less qualified persons in all areas. "Where we could get Ph.D.'s, especially in English, and social sciences before 1956, now we can't get Ph.D.'s even in these 'surplus' areas."

Although (as reported in the tabular data) a number of junior colleges used faculty rank to meet the problem of obtaining additional instructors, the president of a midwestern church-sponsored college said, "Since we are a junior college, our major problem concerns itself with ranking professors and with the problem of permanent tenure. We are a church-sponsored school and the church suggests five ranks: assistant, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Since we have only 27 faculty members we would like to have only one rank. We believe it would make procurement and retention of faculty personnel more successful." At a time when some junior colleges are known to be considering using faculty rank as a means of at-

tracting new members to the faculty or as a way of undergirding merit pay provisions, it is well to heed the remarks of one who has had experience with rank and dislikes the results.

Another dimension to this problem is pointed out by the director of a California junior college, who said, "In the past we have had little difficulty in obtaining adequate, competent instructors for our college. However, we have noted this year that applicants were very reluctant to accept the first offer. They seem to be shopping and looking for higher salaries. We have had a greater number of refusals this year because our salary schedule is not as attractive as it formerly was. We have been unable to increase our salaries on a proportionate basis with wealthier districts."

A number of junior college administrators chose to present problems for which they had not yet found solutions. Other persons chose to make comments which illustrated the problems they had met and the apparently successful attempts they made to solve these problems.

In southern California a public junior college head reported, "We have resorted to the use of the best qualified people we can get from industry on a part-time basis. This is not completely satisfactory, however, because there are so many activities that cannot be expected of part-time personnel."

The president of a publicly-supported technical institute in New York reported similarly: "Staffing has not been too difficult so far. Our evening sessions employ many teachers on a part-time basis who work full-time in industry. The majority of our new teachers in the day program have been recruited from this source." Frequently junior college heads mentioned the use of retired personnel. The president and superintendent of a public junior college district in California reported, "I have one retired Admiral teaching mathematics, and he is doing a fine job."

The head of a metropolitan junior college in the Midwest tapped still another source of potential college instructors, i.e., married women of the community who hold master's degrees and are fully qualified to teach. This junior college head finds that they are especially useful because they are happy to teach part time. It may be that the shortage of junior college faculty members which is expected to develop in the future will encourage more administrators to look for women already in their communities as potential instructional personnel. However, some of the junior college heads have pointed out that they have been forced to go to other areas of the country to find sufficient staff.

A southern California junior college head reported that he went out of his state to solve his staffing problems. Similarly, the dean of a midwestern junior college reported, "While no major difficulties have yet been encountered, the mathematics and chemistry areas are becoming more and more difficult. We are increasing our faculty at a current rate of 20 per cent per year. By robbing the South we have held our own. But what happens when the southern wells run dry?" Some comments pointed out that junior college heads have accepted personnel with qualifications which were more limited than they desired, such as limited teaching experience.

Some successful solutions to the staffing problem reported by junior college

heads pertain to looking after the faculty well-being. For example, the junior college president of a church-related institution in the Southeast mentioned that if members of his faculty let him know of their desires early enough in the year he will help them to secure better paying positions elsewhere. For this reason he believes he has a happy faculty, secure in the knowledge that he will—because he has in the past—get them promotions which they desire even though they are not themselves aware that such jobs may be available.

Other college presidents mentioned that in order to help solve their staffing problems they granted financial assistance and encouragement to faculty members to obtain higher degrees, and, in some cases, secured foundation support for them to do research. In still other cases, presidents told of obtaining fellowships for their faculty members. The dean of a publicly-supported junior college in the Midwest said he permitted his instructors to hold additional jobs, although, "this is not exactly encouraged."

A church-related junior college in the East reported another approach to the faculty shortage problem:

> Group technique (group work, reporting to entire class) and the other devices . . . have not only extended our teacher power but increased our student power tremendously. Self-education is definitely a part of our program and it is working. The students themselves are convinced of the *power* of their independent work and the importance of sharing their findings with others.

Thus it can be seen that the comments that were made fall into three major categories: (1) some junior college presidents indicated they were having no difficulty in recruiting faculty; (2) others stated problems for which solutions have not yet been found; and (3) successful solutions to difficulties were mentioned by a few two-year college heads. To break these down further, the following factors were listed as reasons for the above:

(1) *No difficulty recruiting faculty:*
- Pay generally high salaries
- Enter persons at higher than the minimum starting salaries
- Have good retirement plan
- Share facilities with the high schools
- Upgrade high school teachers
- Have a good location near a major university
- Have a pleasant teaching climate
- Permit science and technical instructors one day off each week for research for additional income.

(2) *Problems not yet solved:*
- Cannot get science and technical instructors
- Cannot get instructors in women's physical education department, librarians, or nursing education
- Have problems with state certification requirements
- Employ candidates with advanced degrees but no professional education courses
- Cannot get Ph.D.'s even in social sciences or humanities
- Need women teachers to balance the staff
- Prefer *not* to have academic rank
- Find an unwillingness to accept the first offer which was made
- Have a low salary schedule
- Are poorly located.

(3) *Solutions which were followed successfully:*
- Used part-time staff and faculty from industry
- Employed persons who have become "disenchanted" with industry
- Employed retired persons
- Employed married women holding master's degrees on a part-time or regular basis

"Robbed" the South or other states
Hired persons with some work beyond the master's degree instead of Ph.D.'s
Hired persons with limited teaching experience
Took persons with bachelor's degrees (who turned out to be good instructors)
Got fellowships and research grants for faculty members
Encouraged independent work by students.

CONCLUSION

From the comments made and from an analysis of the data which appeared in the tables, it is safe to conclude that as time goes on and junior colleges begin to compete more with the four-year colleges and universities for faculty members, it is likely that these practices will be followed to a greater extent by an increasing number of junior colleges. The fact that the four-year colleges have resorted to more of these practices than the junior colleges indicates that they are having somewhat more difficulty in securing faculty or that they are more interested in improving the lot of faculty members. This means that the junior college administrators will either have to become aware of the need to treat the instructional staff better or they will lose their personnel in increasing numbers to senior institutions.

It may be that the present time is appropriate for junior college heads to try out some of the practices which they have not yet used or have not yet been required to use during this period of relative adequacy of junior college instructional staff. Then, should the time come when there is a shortage of junior college instructors and competition becomes keener for their services administrators will be able to make intelligent decisions based on the experience they have had with some of the techniques mentioned here.